

RECEIVED Serial No.: 10/085,324
CENTRAL FAX CENTER Docket No.: 050115-1110

OCT 10 2006

REMARKS

This is a full and timely response to the outstanding non-final Office Action mailed July 7, 2006 (Paper No. 20060622). Upon entry of this response, claims 5-9, 14-17, and 24-35 are pending in the application. In this response, claims 5-6, 8-9, 14, and 16 have been amended, claims 24-35 have been added, and claims 1-4, 10-13, and 18-23 have been cancelled. Applicants respectfully request that the amendments being filed herewith be entered and request that there be reconsideration of all pending claims.

1. Allowable Subject Matter

Applicants acknowledge the Examiner's indication in the Office Action that claims 6-9, 14-17, and 22-23 would be allowable if rewritten to include all of the limitations of the base claim and any intervening claims. Accordingly, Applicants have amended claims 6 and 14 to include the limitations of their respective base claims, such that claims 6 and 14 are now independent claims. Dependent claims 5, 7-9, and 15-17, which depend from now independent claims 6 and 14, are allowable as a matter of law for at least the reason that the dependent claims 5, 7-9, and 15-17 contain all features of independent claim 6 and 14. See, *e.g.*, *In re Fine*, 837 F.2d 1071 (Fed. Cir. 1988). Accordingly, the Examiner is respectfully requested to place claims 6 and 14 in condition for allowance.

Applicants wish to clarify that the amendments to claims 6 and 14 are made for purposes of presenting the claims in an independent claim format as requested by the Examiner, and not in response to any rejections made based on cited art. Because a dependent claim as a matter of law inherently contains all of the limitations of its respective parent independent claim, and any intervening claims, the amendments to claims 6 and 14 do not narrow the scope of claims 6 and 14 as originally filed.

Serial No.: 10/085,324
Docket No.: 050115-1110

2. Claim Objections

Claim 9 are objected to because of an improper dependency. Claim 9 has been amended to refer to now independent claim 6. Applicants respectfully submit that the objection has been overcome, and request that the objection be withdrawn.

3. Rejection of Claims 1-5, 10-13, and 18-21 under 35 U.S.C. §103

Claims 1-5, 10-13, and 18-21 have been rejected under §103(a) as allegedly obvious over *Craig et al.* (7,031,314). Applicants respectfully submit that the rejection of claims 1-4, 10-13, and 18-21 has been rendered moot by claim cancellation. Applicants further submit that the rejection of claim 5 has been overcome by claim amendments made herein which make claim 5 dependent on allowable claim 6.

Claims 1-4, 10-13, and 18-21 are cancelled without prejudice, waiver, or disclaimer, and the rejection of these claims is therefore rendered moot. Applicants take this action merely to reduce the number of disputed issues and to facilitate early allowance and issuance of other claims in the present application. Applicants reserve the right to pursue the subject matter of these cancelled claims in a continuing application, if Applicants so choose, and do not intend to dedicate any of the cancelled subject matter to the public. Applicants expressly reserve the right to present cancelled claims 1-4, 10-13, and 18-21, or variants thereof, in continuing applications to be filed subsequent to the present application.

4. Newly Added Claims

Applicants submit that new claims 24-35 are allowable over the cited references. Specifically, independent claim 24 is allowable for at least the reason that the cited references do not teach, disclose, or suggest the feature of "creating a new table group in the multimedia packet flow table, based on the source address in the IP packet and on a matching destination address

Serial No.: 10/085,324
Docket No.: 050115-1110

cell of an existing table group in the multimedia packet flow table, if: the destination address of the IP packet matches a destination address cell of an existing table group in the multimedia packet flow table; the source address of the IP packet does not match a source address cell of the existing table group that includes universal bits; and a latch bit the existing table group is set.”

Independent claim 31 is allowable for at least the reason that the cited references do not teach, disclose, or suggest the feature of “a processor coupled to the content addressable memory and configured to...store a new table group in the memory, based on the source address in the IP packet and on a matching destination address cell, if: the destination address of the IP packet matches the destination address cell of the at least one table group; the source address cell of the at least one table group includes universal bits and does not match the source address of the IP packet; and a latch bit the at least one table group is set.” Claims 25-30 and 32-35 are allowable over the cited references for at least the reason that each depends from an allowable claim. *In re Fine*, 837 F.2d 1071, 5 U.S.P.Q. 2d 1596, 1598 (Fed. Cir. 1988). Therefore, Applicants request the Examiner to enter and allow the above new claims.

Serial No.: 10/085,324
Docket No.: 050115-1110**RECEIVED
CENTRAL FAX CENTER****CONCLUSION**

Applicants respectfully request that all outstanding objections and rejections be **OCT 10 2006** withdrawn and that this application and presently pending claims 5-9, 14-17, and 24-35 be allowed to issue. Any statements in the Office Action that are not explicitly addressed herein are not intended to be admitted. In addition, any and all findings of inherency are traversed as not having been shown to be necessarily present. Furthermore, any and all findings of well-known art and official notice, or statements interpreted similarly, should not be considered well known since the Office Action does not include specific factual findings predicated on sound technical and scientific reasoning to support such conclusions. If the Examiner has any questions or comments regarding Applicants' response, the Examiner is encouraged to telephone Applicants' undersigned counsel.

Respectfully submitted,

**THOMAS, KAYDEN, HORSTEMEYER
& RISLEY, L.L.P.**By: Karen G. Hazzah
Karen G. Hazzah, Reg. No. 48,472100 Galleria Parkway, NW
Suite 1750
Atlanta, Georgia 30339-5948
Tel: 933-9500
Fax: 951-0933